

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1-2, 4-32 and 34-38 are presently pending. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 14-17, 23-25, 27, 31 and 37-38 have been amended. Certain claims have been amended to correct typographical errors, antecedent basis and/or grammar.

Claims 14-30 are allowed.

Claims 3-10, 33-34 and 36-37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The drawings have been objected to for not showing “every feature of the invention specified in the claims.” In particular, the Examiner alleges that a resistor included in a filter of claim 5 must be shown in the drawings.

The Applicant’s attorney respectfully disagrees. 35 U.S.C. § 113 Drawings states: “The applicant shall furnish a drawing where necessary for the understanding of the subject matter sought to be patented...” (Emphasis added.) Illustrating a resistor represented by “Filter 203” shown in Figs. 2-4 is not necessary for the understanding of the subject matter sought.

Also, 37 C.F.R. § 1.83 states: “...conventional features disclosed in the description and claims, where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention, should be illustrated in the drawing in the form of a graphical drawing symbol or labeled representation (e.g. a labeled rectangular box). A resistor in the claims is represented by at least the rectangular box labeled Filter 203 illustrated in Figs. 2-4. Therefore, withdrawal of the Examiner’s objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 11, 31-32 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,389,898 (“*Taketoshi et al.*”).

Claims 1, 11 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,188,285 (“*Nakanishi et al.*”).

Claims 1-2 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,304,146 (“*Welland*”).

Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Taketoshi et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,650,141 (“*Arawal et al.*”).

Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nakanishi et al.* in view of *Arawal et al.*

Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Welland* in view of *Arawal et al.*

While the Applicant's attorney disagrees with the Examiner's rejections, claims 1 and 31 have been amended to include limitations of objected to claims 3 and 33 in order to expedite prosecution and therefore are believed allowable.

Claims 2, 11-13, 32 and 35 depend from claims 1 and 31 and therefore are patentable for at least the reasons stated above.

Claim 38 has also been amended similar to claim 31 and therefore is believed allowable.

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of claims 1-2, 11-13, 31-32, 35 and 38 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 3, 2005

By: 

Kirk J. DeNiro
Reg. No. 35,854

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS HARMON & DENIRO LLP
685 Market Street, Suite 540
San Francisco, CA 94105-4206
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665